

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are pending. Applicants seek to amend claims 1, 8, 18, 27-31, 34, and 7, and to cancel claim 36. Reconsideration of this application, and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested, in light of the following remarks. The offered amendments are to more clearly define the invention, and place the case in condition for allowance. Alternatively, the offered amendments present the rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal. Therefore, it is appropriate that the Examiner enter all the offered amendments into the case at this time. Rule 116(a); MPEP 714.12, 714.13. Reconsideration of this application, and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 7-13, and 18-25, and 27-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Maffeis (U.S. Patent 6,721,779). Also, claims 5, 6, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maffeis. Also, claims 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maffeis in further view of Oz (U.S. Patent 6,434,141).

The Applicants have amended the claims to more distinctly define the claimed invention, by removing the alternative language between packet filtering and packet rewriting, and by moving various dependent claim limitations into the independent claims, to further clarify packet filtering to “filtering out packets to be discarded” and packet rewriting to be “based on policies that enable network address translation (NAT).” The Applicants respectfully submit that neither Maffeis or Oz disclose or suggest enforcing a managed network environment, including both filtering out packets to be discarded and packet rewriting based on policies that enable network address translation (NAT), as now expressly recited in each of the Applicants’ independent claims.

In addition, the Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art would not understand Maffeis to be disclosing or suggesting a network adapter capable of “communicating with a network control server” as recited in the Applicants’ claims. Rather, Maffeis merely states that the message proxy 1 can be implemented on a “conventional computer network server” (col. 2, lines 65-67), which is different from a “network control server.” Maffeis’ network server simply provides a computing environment on which the proxy 1 can execute. Moreover, the Applicants have amended to more distinctly define the claimed invention, such that the network control server is “for providing configuration information to the network adapter.”

In addition, the Applicants kindly request the Examiner’s reconsideration of various dependent claims which the Applicants believe are not fairly disclosed or suggested by Maffeis. For instance, the Applicants’ claim 23 recites that the network control server is distributed. The Examiner cites Maffeis’ figure 1. The Applicants have reviewed Maffeis in its entirety (including figure 1), and respectfully submit that there is no distributed network control server discussed or suggested. Rather, Maffeis merely discloses a message proxy servicing a number of thin clients. To the extent that the Applicants understand the Examiner’s rejection, the message proxy is not distributed. Nor is the underlying server upon which the proxy is executing. Also, the Applicants maintain their belief that Maffeis fails to disclose or suggest a “network adapter” capable of operating in conjunction with a “core server” or a “routing coordinator” co-located with a “network control server” (as recited in dependent claims 19 and 20, respectively), let alone co-located with a “network control server for providing configuration information to the network adapter” as now expressly recited in the Applicants’ claims. Also, note that dependent

claim 18 now expressly recites that the network control server is not co-located with the network adapter.

The Applicants further note that they do not concede that any of Maffeis or Oz has an effective date that is prior to the Applicants' date of invention.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1-37.

The Applicants believe the above remarks to be fully responsive, and place this application in condition for allowance. Favorable action is solicited. The Applicants kindly invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone, facsimile, or email for efficient resolution, if there are any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted
SANDEEP K. SINGHAL, et al.

Date: August 23, 2006

By: /Neil F. Maloney, Reg. No. 42,833/
Neil F. Maloney
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,833
FENWICK & WEST LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94306
(650) 335-7127
nmaloney@fenwick.com